UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/703,798	11/02/2000	Amanda Johanne Kiliaan	BO 44102 ACW	2164

466 7590 05/17/2004

YOUNG & THOMPSON
745 SOUTH 23RD STREET 2ND FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER	
DAVIS, RUTH A	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1651	

DATE MAILED: 05/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/703,798	KILIAAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ruth A. Davis	1651	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 February 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *39-55* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *39-55* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's amendment and response filed February 25, 2004 has been received and entered into the case. Claims 19 – 38 are canceled; claims 39 – 55 are added. Claims 39 – 55 are pending and have been considered on the merits. All argument have been fully considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, have been withdrawn due to amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 39, 40, 42, 44, 48, 48 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horrobin, della Valle and Fugh-Berman.

Applicant claims a composition for treating and/or preventing dementia syndromes, cognitive degeneration or hearing loss, the composition comprising (a) one omega 3 fattty acid selected from EPA and DHA, one omega 6 fatty acid selected from DHGLA and AA, and one of linoleic or alpha linoleic acid, with a specified ratio; (b) at least two different phospholipids selected from phosphatidylserine, phosphatidylinositol, phosphatidylcholine and phosphatidylethanolamine; and (c) at least one of folic acid, vitamin B12, B6, magnesium or zinc. The composition further comprises (d) citrates or citric acid; or (h) ginkgo biloba extract. The fatty acids are omega-3 and omega-6 fatty acids selected from EPA, DHA, AA and DGLA. Fraction (c) further comprises one of SAMe, choline, betaine or copper, the composition is a nutritional supplement, and the fatty acids are in a specific ratio. Specifically, the composition comprises at least 120 mg long chain fatty acids, 200 mg phospholipids, 200 micrograms folic acid, and 500 mg citrate.

Horrobin teaches compositions comprising essential fatty acids for treating dementia and Alzheimer's disease (abstract). Specifically, linoleic acid, alpha linoleic acid, DGLA, EPA, DHA, AA are combined in specific ratios and amounts (col.2 line 36-59). The composition further comprises citrates (claims, examples).

Della Valle teaches compositions comprising phosphatidylserine and phosphatidylethanolamine in specific ratios for treating dementia (abstract, col.5 line 44-59). Specifically, the compositions comprise 60 – 75% phosphatidylserine and 25 – 40% phosphatidylethanolamine (abstract).

Fugh-Berman teaches ginkgo biloba (p.715), vitamin B12, folate (p.721) and SAMe (p.722) for treating dementia, memory problems and cognitive function.

The above references do not teach all of the ingredients together in the same composition. However, at the time of the claimed invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the instant ingredients for their known benefit, as disclosed by the cited references above, since each is well known in the art for their claimed purpose. Although the references do not specifically teach the exact amounts and/or ratios, it would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize such parameters as a matter of routine experimentation. Moreover, at the time of the claimed invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the cited references to combine the instant ingredients with a reasonable expectation for successfully obtaining a composition for treating and/or preventing dementia syndromes and cognitive degeneration. This rejection is based on the well established proposition of patent law that no invention resides in combining old ingredients of known properties where the results obtained thereby are no more than the additive effect of the ingredients, *In re Sussman,* 1943 C.D. 518.

Thus, the invention as a whole is *prima facie* obvious over the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

4. Claims 52, 53 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horrobin, della Valle, Fugh-Berman and Taiyo Fishery Co.

Applicant claims a composition for treating and/or preventing dementia syndromes, cognitive degeneration or hearing loss, the composition comprising (a) one of EPA, DHA, DHGLA, AA, one of linoleic acid or alpha linolenic acid, (b) phosphatidylcholine, phosphatidylethanolamine, and one of phosphatidylserine or phosphatidylinositol; and (c) at least one of folic acid, vitamin B12, B6, magnesium or zinc. The composition further comprises citrates.

Horrobin teaches compositions comprising essential fatty acids for treating dementia and Alzheimer's disease (abstract). Specifically, linoleic acid, alpha linoleic acid, DGLA, EPA, DHA, AA are combined in specific ratios and amounts (col.2 line 36-59). The composition further comprises citrates (claims, examples).

Della Valle teaches compositions comprising phosphatidylserine and phosphatidylethanolamine in specific ratios for treating dementia (abstract, col.5 line 44-59). Specifically, the compositions comprise 60 – 75% phosphatidylserine and 25 – 40% phosphatidylethanolamine (abstract).

Fugh-Berman teaches ginkgo biloba (p.715), vitamin B12, folate (p.721) and SAMe (p.722) for treating dementia, memory problems and cognitive function.

Taiyo Fishery Co teaches compositions of phosphatidylcholine and phosphatidylethanolamine for treating Alzheimer's disease (abstract).

The above references do not teach all of the ingredients together in the same composition. However, at the time of the claimed invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to combine the instant ingredients for their known benefit, as disclosed by the cited references above, since each is well known in the art for their claimed purpose. Although the references do not specifically teach the exact amounts and/or ratios, it would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize such parameters as a matter of routine experimentation. Moreover, at the time of the claimed invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the cited references to combine the instant ingredients with a reasonable expectation for successfully obtaining a composition for treating and/or preventing dementia syndromes and cognitive degeneration. This rejection is based on the well established proposition of patent law that no invention resides in combining old ingredients of known properties where the results obtained thereby are no more than the additive effect of the ingredients, *In re Sussman,* 1943 C.D. 518.

Thus, the invention as a whole is *prima facie* obvious over the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

5. Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horrobin, della Valle, Fugh-Berman and Yu.

Applicant claims a composition for treating and/or preventing dementia syndromes, cognitive degeneration or hearing loss, the composition comprising (a) one omega 3 fattty acid selected from EPA and DHA, one omega 6 fatty acid selected from DHGLA and AA, and one of linoleic or alpha linoleic acid, with a specified ratio; (b) at least two different phospholipids selected from phosphatidylserine, phosphatidylinositol, phosphatidylcholine and

phosphatidylethanolamine; and (c) at least one of folic acid, vitamin B12, B6, magnesium or zinc. The composition further comprises huperzine A.

Horrobin teaches compositions comprising essential fatty acids for treating dementia and Alzheimer's disease (abstract). Specifically, linoleic acid, alpha linoleic acid, DGLA, EPA, DHA, AA are combined in specific ratios and amounts (col.2 line 36-59). The composition further comprises citrates (claims, examples).

Della Valle teaches compositions comprising phosphatidylserine and phosphatidylethanolamine in specific ratios for treating dementia (abstract, col.5 line 44-59). Specifically, the compositions comprise 60 – 75% phosphatidylserine and 25 – 40% phosphatidylethanolamine (abstract).

Fugh-Berman teaches ginkgo biloba (p.715), vitamin B12, folate (p.721) and SAMe (p.722) for treating dementia, memory problems and cognitive function.

Yu teaches compounds for treating dementia (abstract) wherein huperzine A is a representative compound (col.4 line 24-25).

The above references do not teach all of the ingredients together in the same composition. However, at the time of the claimed invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the instant ingredients for their known benefit, as disclosed by the cited references above, since each is well known in the art for their claimed purpose. Although the references do not specifically teach the exact amounts and/or ratios, it would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize such parameters as a matter of routine experimentation. Moreover, at the time of the claimed invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the cited references to combine the instant ingredients with

a reasonable expectation for successfully obtaining a composition for treating and/or preventing dementia syndromes and cognitive degeneration. This rejection is based on the well established proposition of patent law that no invention resides in combining old ingredients of known properties where the results obtained thereby are no more than the additive effect of the ingredients, *In re Sussman,* 1943 C.D. 518.

Thus, the invention as a whole is *prima facie* obvious over the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

6. Claims 43, 44 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horrobin, della Valle, Fugh-Berman and Smith.

Applicant claims a composition for treating and/or preventing dementia syndromes, cognitive degeneration or hearing loss, the composition comprising (a) one omega 3 fattty acid selected from EPA and DHA, one omega 6 fatty acid selected from DHGLA and AA, and one of linoleic or alpha linoleic acid, with a specified ratio; (b) at least two different phospholipids selected from phosphatidylserine, phosphatidylinositol, phosphatidylcholine and phosphatidylethanolamine; and (c) at least one of folic acid, vitamin B12, B6, magnesium or zinc. The composition further comprises folic acid and B6; one of SAME, choline, betaine or copper.

Horrobin teaches compositions comprising essential fatty acids for treating dementia and Alzheimer's disease (abstract). Specifically, linoleic acid, alpha linoleic acid, DGLA, EPA, DHA, AA are combined in specific ratios and amounts (col.2 line 36-59). The composition further comprises citrates (claims, examples).

Della Valle teaches compositions comprising phosphatidylserine and phosphatidylethanolamine in specific ratios for treating dementia (abstract, col.5 line 44-59). Specifically, the compositions comprise 60 – 75% phosphatidylserine and 25 – 40% phosphatidylethanolamine (abstract).

Fugh-Berman teaches ginkgo biloba (p.715), vitamin B12, folate (p.721) and SAMe (p.722) for treating dementia, memory problems and cognitive function.

Smith teaches compositions for treating Alzheimer's disease, comprising folic acid, vitamin B12 (abstract), betaine, and/or vitamin B6 (col.2 line 43-52).

The above references do not teach all of the ingredients together in the same composition. However, at the time of the claimed invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the instant ingredients for their known benefit, as disclosed by the cited references above, since each is well known in the art for their claimed purpose. Although the references do not specifically teach the exact amounts and/or ratios, it would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize such parameters as a matter of routine experimentation. Moreover, at the time of the claimed invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the cited references to combine the instant ingredients with a reasonable expectation for successfully obtaining a composition for treating and/or preventing dementia syndromes and cognitive degeneration. This rejection is based on the well established proposition of patent law that no invention resides in combining old ingredients of known properties where the results obtained thereby are no more than the additive effect of the ingredients, *In re Sussman,* 1943 C.D. 518.

Thus, the invention as a whole is *prima facie* obvious over the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

7. Claims 44 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horrobin, della Valle, Fugh-Berman and Hutterer.

Applicant claims a composition for treating and/or preventing dementia syndromes, cognitive degeneration or hearing loss, the composition comprising (a) one omega 3 fattty acid selected from EPA and DHA, one omega 6 fatty acid selected from DHGLA and AA, and one of linoleic or alpha linoleic acid, with a specified ratio; (b) at least two different phospholipids selected from phosphatidylserine, phosphatidylinositol, phosphatidylcholine and phosphatidylethanolamine; and (c) at least one of folic acid, vitamin B12, B6, magnesium or zinc. The composition further comprises one of SAME, choline, betaine, or copper; or zinc anc copper at a specified ratio.

Horrobin teaches compositions comprising essential fatty acids for treating dementia and Alzheimer's disease (abstract). Specifically, linoleic acid, alpha linoleic acid, DGLA, EPA, DHA, AA are combined in specific ratios and amounts (col.2 line 36-59). The composition further comprises citrates (claims, examples).

Della Valle teaches compositions comprising phosphatidylserine and phosphatidylethanolamine in specific ratios for treating dementia (abstract, col.5 line 44-59). Specifically, the compositions comprise 60 – 75% phosphatidylserine and 25 – 40% phosphatidylethanolamine (abstract).

Fugh-Berman teaches ginkgo biloba (p.715), vitamin B12, folate (p.721) and SAMe (p.722) for treating dementia, memory problems and cognitive function.

Hutterer teaches compositions comprising choline, zinc and copper (abstract) in specific amounts and ratios (col.4 line 13-23) for treating Alzheimer's disease (abstract).

The above references do not teach all of the ingredients together in the same composition. However, at the time of the claimed invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the instant ingredients for their known benefit, as disclosed by the cited references above, since each is well known in the art for their claimed purpose. Although the references do not specifically teach the exact amounts and/or ratios, it would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize such parameters as a matter of routine experimentation. Moreover, at the time of the claimed invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the cited references to combine the instant ingredients with a reasonable expectation for successfully obtaining a composition for treating and/or preventing dementia syndromes and cognitive degeneration. This rejection is based on the well established proposition of patent law that no invention resides in combining old ingredients of known properties where the results obtained thereby are no more than the additive effect of the ingredients, *In re Sussman,* 1943 C.D. 518.

Thus, the invention as a whole is *prima facie* obvious over the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

8. Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horrobin, della Valle, Fugh-Berman, Smith, Hutterer and Glick.

Applicant claims a composition for treating and/or preventing dementia syndromes, cognitive degeneration or hearing loss, the composition comprising (a) one omega 3 fattty acid selected from EPA and DHA, one omega 6 fatty acid selected from DHGLA and AA, and one of linoleic or alpha linoleic acid, with a specified ratio; (b) at least two different phospholipids selected from phosphatidylserine, phosphatidylinositol, phosphatidylcholine and phosphatidylethanolamine; and (c) at least one of folic acid, vitamin B12, B6, magnesium or zinc. Specifically the composition comprises at least 20 mg EPA, 50 mg DHA, 50 mg AA, 200 mg phospholipids, 200 micrograms folic acid, 100 mg magnesium, 5 mg zinc, 2 mg vitamin B6, 2 micrograms vitamin B12 and 1g citrate.

Horrobin teaches compositions comprising essential fatty acids for treating dementia and Alzheimer's disease (abstract). Specifically, linoleic acid, alpha linoleic acid, DGLA, EPA, DHA, AA are combined in specific ratios and amounts (col.2 line 36-59). The composition further comprises citrates (claims, examples).

Della Valle teaches compositions comprising phosphatidylserine and phosphatidylethanolamine in specific ratios for treating dementia (abstract, col.5 line 44-59). Specifically, the compositions comprise 60 – 75% phosphatidylserine and 25 – 40% phosphatidylethanolamine (abstract).

Fugh-Berman teaches ginkgo biloba (p.715), vitamin B12, folate (p.721) and SAMe (p.722) for treating dementia, memory problems and cognitive function.

Smith teaches compositions for treating Alzheimer's disease, comprising folic acid, vitamin B12 (abstract), betaine, and/or vitamin B6 (col.2 line 43-52).

Hutterer teaches compositions comprising choline, zinc and copper (abstract) in specific amounts and ratios (col.4 line 13-23) for treating Alzheimer's disease (abstract).

Glick teaches administering dietary supplements of magnesium for preventing and controlling dementia and memory loss (abstract, col.3).

The above references do not teach all of the ingredients together in the same composition. However, at the time of the claimed invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the instant ingredients for their known benefit, as disclosed by the cited references above, since each is well known in the art for their claimed purpose. Although the references do not specifically teach the exact amounts and/or ratios, it would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize such parameters as a matter of routine experimentation. Moreover, at the time of the claimed invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the cited references to combine the instant ingredients with a reasonable expectation for successfully obtaining a composition for treating and/or preventing dementia syndromes and cognitive degeneration. This rejection is based on the well established proposition of patent law that no invention resides in combining old ingredients of known properties where the results obtained thereby are no more than the additive effect of the ingredients, *In re Sussman,* 1943 C.D. 518.

Thus, the invention as a whole is *prima facie* obvious over the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

9. Claims 46 – 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horrobin, della valle, Fugh-Berman and Rabien.

Applicant claims a composition for treating and/or preventing dementia syndromes, cognitive degeneration or hearing loss, the composition comprising (a) one omega 3 fattty acid selected from EPA and DHA, one omega 6 fatty acid selected from DHGLA and AA, and one of linoleic or alpha linoleic acid, with a specified ratio; (b) at least two different phospholipids selected from phosphatidylserine, phosphatidylinositol, phosphatidylcholine and phosphatidylethanolamine; and (c) at least one of folic acid, vitamin B12, B6, magnesium or zinc. The composition further comprises (f) one or more selected from carnitine, vitamin B1, B5 and coenzyme Q10; (g) one or more antioxidants selected from vitamin C, E, lipoic acid, selenium salt and carotenoids.

Horrobin teaches compositions comprising essential fatty acids for treating dementia and Alzheimer's disease (abstract). Specifically, linoleic acid, alpha linoleic acid, DGLA, EPA, DHA, AA are combined in specific ratios and amounts (col.2 line 36-59). The composition further comprises citrates (claims, examples).

Della Valle teaches compositions comprising phosphatidylserine and phosphatidylethanolamine in specific ratios for treating dementia (abstract, col.5 line 44-59). Specifically, the compositions comprise 60 – 75% phosphatidylserine and 25 – 40% phosphatidylethanolamine (abstract).

Fugh-Berman teaches ginkgo biloba (p.715), vitamin B12, folate (p.721) and SAMe (p.722) for treating dementia, memory problems and cognitive function.

Rabien teaches compositions comprising alpha lipoic, panthothenic acid (vitamin B5) and vitamin E for treating Alzheimer's disease (abstract).

The above references do not teach all of the ingredients together in the same composition. However, at the time of the claimed invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the instant ingredients for their known benefit, as disclosed by the cited references above, since each is well known in the art for their claimed purpose. Although the references do not specifically teach the exact amounts and/or ratios, it would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize such parameters as a matter of routine experimentation. Moreover, at the time of the claimed invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the cited references to combine the instant ingredients with a reasonable expectation for successfully obtaining a composition for treating and/or preventing dementia syndromes and cognitive degeneration. This rejection is based on the well established proposition of patent law that no invention resides in combining old ingredients of known properties where the results obtained thereby are no more than the additive effect of the ingredients, *In re Sussman,* 1943 C.D. 518.

Thus, the invention as a whole is *prima facie* obvious over the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Response to Arguments

Applicant argues that the references do not teach the claimed amounts or ratios.

However this argument fails to persuade because as evidenced by the cited references, each of the claimed ingredients were used in the art in compositions for treating dementia syndromes. Although they do not teach the claimed amounts or ratios, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize the amounts of known active ingredients for the same purpose, as a matter of routine practice. Moreover, at the time of the claimed invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the instant ingredients and optimize the amounts, with a reasonable expectation for successfully obtaining a composition effective for treating dementia syndromes.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ruth A. Davis whose telephone number is 571-272-0915. The examiner can normally be reached on M-H (7:00-4:30); altn. F (7:00-3:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ruth A. Davis; rad
May 6, 2004.

LEON B. LANKFORD, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINER